

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-6 were pending. Claims 1, 2 and 5 have been amended, claim 3 has been canceled, and new claims 7-11 have been added. Therefore, upon entry of this amendment, which is respectfully requested, claims 1, 2 and 4-11 will be pending.

The specification was objected to for various informalities. Appropriate correction by way of amendment to the specification has been made. No new matter has been added hereby.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reilly *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,740,549, in view of Leighton *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,726. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that the Reilly and Leighton references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the claims as currently pending. Although Applicants respectively disagree with the Examiner's characterizations that claims as previously pending were obvious in view of the cited references, Applicants have amended the claims to expedite prosecution and to more particularly point out an aspect of the invention. It is respectfully asserted that the amended claims are novel and unobvious in view of the cited references. For example, these references fail to teach or suggest the limitation of "pushing HTML content related to the streaming content to the browser window", or the limitation of "simultaneously playing said streaming content on said media player and displaying said HTML content in the data frame" as is recited in claim 1. Similar limitations are also presented in new claim 9. Nowhere do Reilly and Leighton, taken alone or together, suggest playing streaming media content and/or advertisement content while simultaneously displaying HTML content related to the streaming content, wherein the HTML content is pushed to the browser. Support for these added limitations can be found throughout the application as filed, for example, at page 4, lines 22 to 28, page 6, line 8 to 12, and page 14, line 27 to page 15, line 11.

Dependent claims 2, 5, 10 and 11 recite various aspects of the pushing limitation, and are each novel and non-obvious over the cited references.


With regard to new claim 8, the cited references fail to teach or suggest the limitation of "wherein said streaming content includes one or more embedded commands that references HTML content corresponding to said streaming content" or the limitation of "executing said one or more embedded commands to retrieve the referenced HTML content" as is recited in claim 8 for similar reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Gerald T. Gray  
Reg. No. 41,797

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 925-472-5000  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
Attachments  
GTG:sea  
60462890 v1